DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 287 562 PS 016 834

TITLE All-Day Kindergarten Program. Final Evaluation Report, Fiscal 1985.
INSTITUTION Chicago Public Schools, Ill.
PUB DATE Sep 86
NOTE 65p.; For Fiscal 1986 Final Evaluation Report, see PS 016 883.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Affective Measures; Attendance; *Educationally Disadvantaged; *Kindergarten; Language Acquisition; Parent Attitudes; *Parent Participation; Pretests Posttests; Primary Education; Program Evaluation; Reading Instruction; Teacher Qualifications
IDENTIFIERS Chicago Public Schools IL; *Full Day Programs

ABSTRACT

This report evaluated the third year of operation (1984-85) of the Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten Program. The goals of the program were to (1) promote growth in reading readiness and mathematics skills for educationally disadvantaged children; (2) further the affective growth of these children; and (3) encourage parents' increased participation in their children's schools. In the principal findings of this report it is noted that all-day kindergartners showed gains of five to eight months in six months of instruction. In addition, children whose parents participated in the classroom and who conducted learning activities at home were twice as likely to gain more through the school year than children of nonparticipating parents. Results also showed that children improved more than they regressed on all items of an affective rating scale, and that attendance rates were higher than those in city-wide kindergarten. Finally, teachers and aides appeared to be qualified for their jobs. Recommendations for teachers include: (1) replacing use of ditto sheets with a holistic language approach; (2) giving guidance to parents concerning learning activities for their children; (3) providing an increased number of activities in order to promote affective growth; (4) providing activities for children who finish their work early; (5) preparing and grading work out of class; and (6) retaining some children in a special pre-first grade class. (PCB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

BUREAU OF ECIA PROGRAM EVALUATION

EDUCATION CONSOLIDATION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT

CHAPTER 2

ALL-DAY KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

EVALUATION REPORT, FISCAL 1985

Chicago Public Schools
Manford Byrd, Jr.
General Superintendent of Schools
September 1986

It is the policy of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, religion, age, handicaps unrelated to ability, or sex in its educational program or employment policies or practices.

BOARD OF EDUCATION
CITY OF CHICAGO

George Munoz, President
William M. Farroe, Vice-President
Ms. Linda G. Corondo
Mrs. Frances C. Davis
Clark Burrus
Frank W. Gardner
Mrs. Mattie Hopkins
Mrs. Patricia M. O'Hern
Mr. Michael Penn
Ms. Myrna E. Salazar
Mrs. Winnie Slusser

Chicago Public Schools

Manford Byrd, Jr.
General Superintendent of Schools

Irving M. Brauer
Director of Projects
Department of Research and Evaluation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose, Rationale, and Funding of Program	1
Purpose of Report and Evaluation Procedures	1
IMPLEMENTATION	3
Scope and Organization of the Program	3
Student Background and Selection	3
Staff	5
Inservice	6
Instructional Activities	6
Instructional Materials	10
Instructional Methods	11
Learning Environment	12
Parent Involvement	12
EVALUATION	17
Pupil Attendance	17
Teacher Attendance	18
Achievement Outcomes	18
Parent Involvement and Children's Test Results	22
Affective Growth	24
Teacher Perceptions	25
Aide Perceptions	25
Parent Perceptions	25
CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS	29
SUMMARY	35
REFERENCES	37

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)

PAGE

APPENDICES

A--Affective Rating Scale 41

B--Observation Form 43

C--Teacher Questionnaire 49

D--Parent Questionnaire 55

E--Teacher Aide Questionnaire 59

TABLES

1--Class and Enrollment Data 4

2--Student Background 5

3--Instructional Time Devoted to Skill Areas 7

4--Percentages of Teachers Spending No Time in Certain Areas ... 8

5--Destinations of Field Trips 9

6--Percentages of Teachers Suggesting Activities for Parents to Do at Home 13

7--Percent of Parent Participation 14

8--Percent of Parents Helping Children at Home 16

9--Pupil Attendance 17

10--Subtests of Iowa Tests of Basic Skills 18

11--Overall Results on Iowa Tests: Chapter 2 19

12--Results on Iowa Tests: Kindergarten Groups Compared 21

13--Differences in Parents' Answers to Questions about Children's Growth 26

1985 All-Day Kindergarten Program Evaluation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report evaluates the third year of operation (1984-1985) of the Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten (ADK) Program. The goals of the program were 1) to promote growth in reading readiness and mathematics skills for the educationally disadvantaged five-year-olds enrolled in the program, 2) to further the affective growth of these pupils, and 3) to encourage parents' increased participation in their children's schools. The program provided ADK for 591 pupils in the six original Child-Parent Center (CPC) sites. Thirteen of the 23 classes were part of the parent schools and consisted primarily of five-year-olds who were having their first school experience. (The term "parent schools" means the elementary schools which had a CPC attached to them). Ten classes were part of the CPCs and consisted primarily of five-year-olds who had had one or two previous years in the CPCs.

The principal findings of this report are these:

- Results on five subtests of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS), given as a pretest in October and a posttest in May, showed that the median gain of Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergartners was five to eight months in six months of instruction. Below norms on the pretest in all areas except word analysis, the median scores of these children were at or above norms in both word analysis and math by the posttest. In vocabulary and, especially, language the children were lowest on both the pretest and the posttest and made the smallest gains. Posttest and medians in language were lower in 1985 than in 1984.

- Children's test scores were analyzed in several ways to see if their parents' involvement in their schools (as reported on the parent questionnaires) made a difference. The findings were:

  1) Children of active parents were twice as likely to gain more through the school year than children of non-active parents.

  2) For parent-school children a significant difference appeared between the post scores of those children whose parents were active in the classroom and those whose parents were only slightly involved. This difference was four months higher scores in language and word analysis for children of active parents. These results compare with last year's findings of a significant difference between the gain scores of the CPC children whose parents were active in the classroom and those whose parents were inactive. This difference was 3-4 months more gain in vocabulary and language for children of active parents (Chicago Public Schools, 1985).

  3) The gain scores for children whose parents said they had not participated at all at their children's schools were compared

with the gain scores for children whose parents said they had participated several times or more. Significant differences appeared in the listening subtest for the question asking how often parents had been to school in connection with their children's kindergarten and in the two subtests of listening and word analysis for the question asking whether parents had volunteered in the classroom. In both cases the differences were in favor of more parental involvement.

4) A final analysis compared the gain scores for children whose parents said they had conducted certain activities at home with their children and those whose parents said they had not conducted the activities. In 12 of the 15 cases, children who had done the activity with their parents made significantly higher test scores than children who had not done the activity. The most effective activities were parents reading to their children, providing children with art and writing supplies, and getting children library cards.

- An Affective Rating Scale, developed by the Department of Research and Evaluation to measure children's affective growth, was filled out by teachers on each child in October as a pretest and again in June as a posttest. An analysis of the ratings on these scales showed that, according to teachers' estimates, children improved more through the year across all items then they regressed or did not change at all.

- Attendance rates for Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergartners were improved over 1984 and for the third straight year were higher than the citywide kindergarten rates. Attendance rates for the Chapter 2 kindergarten teachers were also better than the attendance rates for kindergarten teachers throughout the city.

- Parents' reactions on their questionnaires to the Chapter 2 ADK Program were highly favorable: they and their children liked the program, and they thought their children learned and grew during the year, with CPC parents indicating more learning and growing than parent-school parents. According to head teachers' estimates, up to 100 percent of CPC parents participated in school activities, but less than 50 percent of parent-school parents did so. According to the parent questionnaires, CPC involvement generally improved in 1985.

- Teachers and aides for the Chapter 2 ADK Program appeared qualified for their jobs. They appreciated the strength of the ADK in allowing more time for a variety of activities to make up for deficits in the backgrounds of educationally disadvantaged children.

In order to improve and strengthen the Chapter 2 ADK Program, the following recommendations were made on the basis of statistical analyses, test results, questionnaires, and observations:

- Because test results consistently show these children to be lowest in vocabulary and language, holistic language activities should replace the predominant fragmented ditto sheet approach. These activities include:

  1) Teachers reading aloud to their classes every day;

  2) Children given time in class to look at picture books and "read" the pictures to themselves or others;

  3) Using libraries more often, including frequent trips to school and public libraries, getting children library cards, and allowing children to take books home from the classroom or the school library;

  4) Parents reading more to children, both in school and at home;

  5) Utilizing more language experience activities such as teachers writing down children's own stories, letters, and lists and then reading them back to the children;

  6) Allowing children to write text meaningful to them, such as journals and letters, for which they write however they are able and which they then read back to someone else, with the emphasis at all times on meaning, not correctness;

  7) Providing children with more opportunities for oral expression such as "Show and Tell," dramatization of stories, and puppetry;

  8) More emphasis on higher-level thinking skills: summarizing and comparing books, categorizing foods, predicting and determining cause and effect in stories.

- As our analyses of parent involvement have shown, schools and teachers must continue to make strong efforts at involving parents in school activities, especially in classroom activities and especially in the case of the parent-school parents. Teachers must guide the parents, suggesting that they read and cook with their children, take their children to the library, and provide writing materials and models of writing for their children.

- More activities should be designed to promote affective growth, including requiring children to help out in all classrooms, and role playing and discussing situations involving prosocial behavior.

- The amount of wasted time in classrooms could be reduced by providing appropriate activities for children who finish their work first and teachers preparing materials and grading work out of class.

- Some children need to be retained in a special pre-first grade class, according to the teachers' questionnaires. This would reduce the chance that such students would require more extensive help at a later date.

The Chapter 2 ADK Program exhibits numerous strengths: children gaining on the ITBS and growing in affective areas, good pupil and teacher attendance, parental involvement, attractive learning environments, continual inservicing, adequately available materials and supplies. The recommendations made in this report would make the program even better and give these disadvantaged children a better start at becoming productive members of society.

CHAPTER 2 ALL-DAY KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT 1985

INTRODUCTION

Purpose, Rationale, and Funding of Program

For the third year, since December 1982, a full-day kindergarten (five hours of instruction) has been in place at the six original sites of the Child-Parent Center (CPC) Program. These centers, begun in 1967, were designed to accelerate reading readiness and academic success for disadvantaged children at the preschool, kindergarten, and primary levels. The need for all-day kindergarten has been mandated by kindergarten's new role of preparing children for structured, teacher-directed instruction. In an all-day program, research studies have shown, more time can be devoted to the development of language and number concepts, to strengthening parent involvement in the child's education, and to activities providing for increased individualization of instruction, greater socialization with peers and adults, and different learning modalities.

For fiscal 1985, ECIA Chapter 2 funded 11 of 23 teachers and most of the 23 teacher aides. The remainder of the funding came from Chapter 1 and from Chicago Public School general funds. The overall goals were for the educationally disadvantaged five-year-olds enrolled in the program to show growth in reading readiness and mathematics skills and in affective areas, as well as for increased numbers of parents to participate in the program. These goals fit in with the systemwide objective of reducing the number of students achieving below national norms in 80 percent of the city's elementary schools.

Purpose of Report and Evaluation Procedures

In order to assess the implementation and outcomes of this all-day kindergarten program, the following questions were formulated:

Did pupils show progress in the areas of reading readiness and number concepts?

Did pupils show evidence of affective growth?

Did the participation of parents help the program? What percent of parents contributed time?

Were there problems implementing the program?

What materials and activities were used to instruct students?

How did all concerned view their participation?

Were the experience and educational background of the teachers and their aides appropriate for their duties in the program?

Were the inservice meetings useful?

Did All-Day Kindergarten improve children's school attendance? How do the teacher attendance rates compare with citywide teacher attendance rates?

These evaluation procedures were conducted in order to answer the proposed questions:

- A standardized achievement test was administered to students. The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, Form 7, Level 5: Early Primary Battery was administered as a pretest in October 1984 and as a posttest in May 1985.

- Classroom teachers filled out for each pupil an Affective Rating Scale (Appendix A) in October 1984, as a pretest, and in June 1985, as a posttest. This instrument, devised by the staff of the Department of Research and Evaluation, is designed to measure growth in students' attitudes toward academic areas, their social skills, and their personal adjustment to school.

- Observations of all 23 classrooms were conducted by staff of the Department of Research and Evaluation during November 1984 and January 1985. At these times the Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten Observation Form (Appendix B) was filled out for each classroom, and teachers as well as head teachers were interviewed.

- All-Day Kindergarten classroom teachers completed a questionnaire in June 1985: Kindergarten Teacher Questionnaire (Appendix C). These questions concerned the teachers' experience and educational background, the implementation and evaluation of the program, instructional activities and materials, inservice meetings, and parent activities.

- Parents completed a questionnaire in June 1985: Kindergarten Parent Questionnaire (Appendix D). This form asked the parents to evaluate the program and to list the activities they conducted with their children both at home and in school.

- Teacher aides were also surveyed by means of the Kindergarten Teacher Aide Questionnaire (Appendix E). This instrument asked the aides about their experience and educational background, their duties, and their evaluation of the program.

- Attendance rates for Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten students were taken from principals' summaries. In addition, teacher attendance rates were compiled from the teacher attendance file constructed by the Technical Services Bureau of the Department of Research and Evaluation.

IMPLEMENTATION

Scope and Organization of the Program

This program provided All-Day Kindergarten for almost 600 pupils in six schools. Ten of the 23 classes were part of CPCs and consisted primarily of five-year-olds who had had one or two previous years at the CPCs. Thirteen classes were part of the parent schools and consisted primarily of five-year-olds who were having their first school experience. (The term "parent schools" means the elementary schools which had a CPC attached to them). Table 1 sets forth the classes and their enrollment. The mean enrollment for all classes was 25.7, up over the 1984 mean enrollment of 24.1. The CPC classes, with a mean number of 23.7 students, were smaller in size than the parent-school classes (27.2 students). For the CPCs the range of students enrolled was 18 to 29, for the parent schools 22 to 31. All schools had three classes except Carver/Wheatley which had eight classes. These figures are based on observations and interviews made during November 1984 and January 1985 by staff of the Department of Research and Evaluation.

The parent volunteer component of this All-Day Kindergarten program was established in conjunction with the total parent program under the direction of the curriculum-parent resource teacher of the CPC Adaption/Expansion Program (CPCX) and the parent resource teacher of the CPC. Parents volunteered in the kindergarten classroom or participated in supportive parent activities as planned by the classroom and parent resource teachers.

The principals at each site were responsible for the initiation of the program at the local level, providing those activities necessary for successful implementation, including the ordering of materials. Inservice and support services were provided by CPC head teachers, CPC parent resource teachers, and CPCX curriculum-parent resource teachers. At all schools the CPC head teachers were in change of the programs; at one school the assistant principal split the responsibility. Other personnel providing part-time support services were school/community representatives, librarians, gym teachers, nurses, and clerks.

Student Background and Selection

The six schools having Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergartens are situated in predominantly black neighborhoods. One school (King/Dickens) serves, in addition, a large Hispanic population (35 percent). The average poverty index of these schools is 61 percent, as compared to the citywide figure in fiscal 1985 of 42.3 percent. All the schools have from three to eight government or city funded special programs, with one (Jensen/Miller) being an Options for Knowledge school.

Table 2 shows the difference in background between All-Day Kindergarten students in the CPCs and the parent schools. These figures are based on information provided by the 23 teachers when they were interviewed in November 1984 and January 1985.

TABLE 1

CLASS AND ENROLLMENT DATA FOR
CHAPTER 2 ALL-DAY KINDERGARTENS FY 1985

Parent Schools	CPCs	Number of Classes	Room Numbers	Parent School Enrollment	CPC Enrollment
Carver Primary		5	114	30	
			115	26	
			310	29	
			311	30	
			313	30	
	Wheatley CPC	3	307		28
			308		27
			312		25
Henson		1	102	27	
	Olive CPC	2	103		19
			105		18
Jensen		2	104	24	
			105	26	
	Miller CPC	1	103		24
King		2	102	24	
			120	22	
	Dickens CPC (bilingual)	1	106		25
Melody		2	118	31	
			122	31	
	Cole CPC	1	102		29
Webster		1	102	24	
	Hansberry CPC	2	104		22
			106		20
CPC Totals		10			237
Parent School Totals		13		354	
	Totals	23			591
Mean number of students per classroom			CPC	23.7	
			Parent Schools	27.2	
			Total Group	25.7	

TABLE 2

STUDENT BACKGROUND

Group	Enrollment	Students who attended CPC before kdg.	Students who attended other preschool	Students who did not attend preschool
CPC Kdg.	237	90%	--	10%
Parent School kdg.	354	37%	6%	57%

In spite of the fact that for administrative purposes six classrooms exchanged the types of children assigned to them (e.g., CPC children were put in a parent school class), the CPC children still had considerably more preschool experience than the other children. Another difference between the two groups of students was in their selection. The parent school kindergartens enrolled any five-year-olds in their district. The CPCs, on the other hand, not only enrolled their students as three-or four-year-olds but chose those most in need in terms of educational deprivation and required a parent commitment to the program.

Staff

Twenty-one of the 23 teachers returned their questionnaire (Appendix C). According to these questionnaires, the teachers in the program had total years of teaching experience ranging from 2 to 26 years, with a median of 11.5. Their median number of years of kindergarten teaching experience was six. Fifty-seven percent of the teachers held a master's degree, with two of them having 36 hours of graduate work beyond the master's degree. Nineteen of them were certified for kindergarten/primary teaching by the Chicago Board of Examiners. Two held intermediate/upper certificates and two were full-time-basis substitutes. In general, then, these teachers would seem qualified for their jobs in terms of teaching experience and educational background. The only missing personnel during fiscal 1985 were an aide absent at Olive for six weeks and no CPCX curriculum-parent resource teacher at Melody. In the latter case, however, the principal assumed most of the duties. A bilingual teacher was assigned to the Dickens CPC class, in addition to a regular classroom teacher. Wheatley and Cole both rotate their kindergarten teachers, keeping the same children with the same teacher from age 3 to age 5.

Seventeen of the 23 teacher aides returned the Teacher Aide Questionnaire (Appendix E), a return rate of almost 75 percent. Their median number of years as a teacher aide was 15. Sixty-five percent of them have had one to three years of college training, with all of them mentioning additional pertinent experience, such as mothering children themselves, working in preschools and in kindergarten summer programs, and participating in youth programs. Their primary duties consisted of helping individual students; monitoring student activities, including meal times; conducting lessons for

small groups of students; preparing lesson materials; and performing clerical tasks. Over 40 percent of the aides said they planned all activities together with their teachers, being allowed to help in every aspect of the teaching. However, a few teachers did not see their aide as more than a disciplinarian and clerical worker.

Inservice

The Bureau of Early Childhood Programs, Department of Government Funded Programs, presented three inservice sessions for the Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten teachers in fiscal 1985. In October a DEEO administrator shared ideas on enhancing students' self-esteem, and in March a CPCX curriculum parent resource teacher gave a program on classroom management. The May inservice was a sharing session, with teachers exchanging language arts and art activities. Although only 17 teachers attended this session, 13 teachers stated on their questionnaires that it had been the most useful inservice for them, probably because it had offered them numerous practical suggestions for use in class. Such practical suggestions were mentioned by several teachers on their questionnaires as a desirable inservice objective. When teachers were asked their ideas for future inservices, the most frequent answer was how to set up and use learning centers. (The first inservice in FY 1986 was on this topic.) Sharing sessions, with make-and-take activities, would also be popular. Some concern was shown over the location of inservices, with the Pershing Road headquarters building seen by several teachers as the most convenient site because of its central location. Other ideas for future inservices were how to involve parents, how to work effectively with aides, and how to promote thinking and problem solving skills.

A unique series of inservices for the teacher aides was planned by the Chapter 2 Early Childhood coordinator. Nine sessions were set up on language development, auditory discrimination, verbal expression, sensory perception, and critical thinking skills. The aim of this series, which included make-and-take materials, was to help the aides implement activities to reinforce skills taught by the teacher. In addition to these large inservice sessions for teachers and aides, frequent on-site inservices were provided by the Chapter 2 Early Childhood coordinator, the CPC head teachers, and the parent resource teachers. In some schools, teachers met regularly to plan and share ideas, and outside speakers came in for workshops.

Instructional Activities

Table 3 sets forth the amount of time teachers said on their questionnaires they devoted to various subjects. These figures show the variety of activities allowed by the All-Day Kindergarten Program as well as the attention paid to the basic skills of reading and mathematics. The median number of minutes spent each day on math was 40 and on all reading/language activities 138. These figures compare to the 1984 respective figures of 35-40 and 135 and the 1983 figures of 40 and 110. Some teachers apparently spend no time on holistic reading activities such as reading aloud to the class and library period, nor do some use interest centers or provide activities in social studies, small and large muscle coordination, music, art, nutrition, or free play (Table 4). One different approach to both reading and mathematics was the use at Wheatley CPC of two computers, which were gifts to that school. A teacher from National College of Education provided teachers and parents with inservice instruction on the use of computers and certified some kindergarten children to become classroom tutors.

TABLE 3

INSTRUCTIONAL TIME DEVOTED TO SKILL AREAS

Skill Area	Number of teachers answering	Range per day in minutes	Median number of minutes per day*
Oral language/vocabulary development	20	10-60	30
Reading readiness	19	10-120	45
Reading aloud to class	19	0-30	15
Library period	18	0-45	18
Basal reading	17	20-90	30
Math and number concepts	19	0-60	40
Social studies	18	0-35	15
Science	18	4-35	15
Interest centers	18	0-35	20
Large muscle coordination (e.g. physical education)	18	0-45	20
Small muscle coordination (e.g. writing, beadwork)	16	0-50	20
Music	17	0-30	15
Art	18	0-35	15
Nutrition/food	13	0-30	20
Free play	16	0-30	20
Recess	14	0-30	15
Meal time	17	10-40	30
Rest	17	0-35	15
Other	2		
Traveling time to gym and lunch			10
Health			12

*These minutes will add up to more than the total number of minutes per day since some activities overlap.

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS SPENDING NO TIME IN CERTAIN AREAS

Skill Area	Percent of Teachers
Reading aloud to class (by teacher or librarian)	37
Social Studies	16
Interest centers	11
Large muscle coordination	11
Small muscle coordination	11
Music	16
Art	32
Nutrition	42
Free Play	32
Recess	37

Number = 19

Note: The source for these percentages was the teachers' questionnaires. The figures include teachers who either indicated that they spent no time on the activity or did not respond to the item.

Program observations corroborated that reading was the most usual activity in these All-Day Kindergarten classes. Mastery Learning was being conducted in 26 percent of the classes, basal reading programs in 43 percent. These activities ranged from very preliminary skills, such as learning the parts of a page, to phonic exercises on beginning sounds and predicting what happens next in a story. Several classes were observed using the Distar Language Program, and 30 percent of the classes were writing. This writing instruction consisted of children learning to write their names and copying a "Morning Story." As for oral language, children were observed in three classes talking to teachers or aides about weather, the calendar, and their birthdays. In another three classes children were participating in listening exercises such as the game "Simon Says" or following a record which was giving directions. In one case they were practicing poems and a play for an assembly program.

On the questionnaire, 37 percent of the teachers indicated that they do not read aloud to the class nor do they have a library period (Table 4). In spite of teachers having been urged in inservices to read aloud, only 78 percent of them when interviewed said they read stories to their classes every day. No teacher was observed reading aloud, although the school librarian was doing so in two classes. Furthermore, only three teachers said their pupils could choose library books to take home; two others mentioned that children could buy their own books in the school, and only one mentioned the possibility of children going to the neighborhood library.

Twenty two percent of the classes were using Mastery Learning materials for math, learning to recognize numbers and count numbers in sets. Only once was art instruction being provided to an entire class as students put together snowmen, although coloring sheets were passed out several times for what one teacher admitted was "busy work." No science lessons were observed, and the only social studies activity seen was one class finding and pasting into scrapbooks pictures of people of different races. Children were also observed at gym and at lunch.

According to the teachers' questionnaires, field trips were taken by all but one class, as a means of extending student's experiences. One class took as many as eight trips, but the median number was three. Table 5 presents the destinations of these trips.

TABLE 5

DESTINATIONS OF FIELD TRIPS

Destination	Number of classes taking trip	Percentage
Zoo	14	61
Play (dramatic performance)	11	48
Farm	7	30
Museum	5	22
Circus	4	17
Planetarium	4	17
Aquarium	4	17
Rodeo	3	13
Botanical gardens	3	13
Camping trip	2	9
Other (ice show, nature center, fire station)	1	4

The teachers said they felt that the trips to the zoo were the most meaningful to their classes because kindergarten children relate well to live animals, the children could move about during the trip, and their experience of the world was expanded. Other trips deemed worthwhile, for their enjoyment as well as their teaching value, were the farm, the planetarium, the plays, and the camp. The teachers also indicated that preparation for the field trips beforehand as well as activities connected with them after they had taken place were highly worthwhile. The classes talked about the trips, looked at pictures and read stories connected with them, established rules, wrote experience stories about them, and produced art works derived from them.

On their questionnaires teachers also described activities they implemented in order to strengthen students' affective growth, although 33 percent left this question blank. The most frequent answers were mirror games (with combs, brushes, lotions, and soap) and a consistent attitude of approval. Class discussions were mentioned several times: about feelings, sharing, dealing with others, being a friend, reactions to pictures. Children wrote experience stories about themselves and acted out their experiences. Guidance activities were utilized, including filmstrips, movies, and puppets. Interesting new ideas were tried out: bubble activities, a sea shell collection, Weekly Readers. Finally, children were allowed to help in class by serving lunch, holding the flag during morning exercises, leading games, and becoming teacher at some times.

Instructional Materials

During 1985 the basic instructional materials for these All-Day Kindergartens were still the Chicago Mastery Learning Programs in Reading and Math. In addition, in order to provide a firmer background in reading and to introduce the children to the basal reading series which they would be using in first grade, teachers began work in basal programs. The basal series most often reported by teachers as being used were those by Houghton Mifflin, Lippincott, Harcourt Brace, Ginn, and American Book, with one school each using Distar and Open Court.

About half the teachers said they were satisfied with their basal series because it provided a total sequential program or was strong in phonics and/or comprehension. At the same time, some complaints were registered: the series did not teach all components of reading, it did not include extra activities for all levels, or the teacher directions were too lengthy. Such complaints should be taken up by the curriculum selection committee of the teacher's school. In addition to working on Mastery Learning and basal materials, children were observed using teacher-made worksheets and cards, experience charts, library books, puzzles, games, scissors, and paste. Audiovisual materials observed were one filmstrip on a book and several records with stories and games.

Although 75 percent of the teachers indicated that all ordered materials had been received, a few problems were mentioned. Some tables and chairs were missing; a chart stand was needed at Wheatley and social studies material at King. Mastery Learning components were not always available on time. As for supplies, some teachers and head teachers complained about a lack of crayons, paper, pencils, and manipulatives.

Instructional Methods

Teachers were observed using a variety of instructional methods, depending on their style: from a highly-structured to a more open environment with children working well independently. In most classes there were two or three groups, but in one class all the groups received the same work and in several classes instruction was being provided to the whole group. Many positive reinforcements were noticed: hugs, compliments, the whole class clapping for right answers, points on the board for listening with rewards periodically handed out. Negative actions on the part of a few teachers were also observed, such as anger, yelling, and threats. Over successive years of observation, the same negative actions have been noted on the part of these same few teachers.

These Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten teachers provided numerous examples of exemplary teaching methods. They would repeat directions clearly and often until they were sure the students understood. They corrected improper language, asked for complete sentences, and defined words met with in books or conversation. In reading lessons and stories they worked on higher-level comprehension skills, such as cause/effect, sequence, comparisons. They also compared records and the weather over several days, worked on position words, and asked inference questions requiring answers in whole sentences. Many teachers (but not all) used lunch as a learning experience. They talked about the foods the children were eating, classified foods, gave lessons on nutrition and manners, and allowed the children to help by setting the tables, serving the food, and cleaning up. Some teachers made specific provisions for the faster children who finished their work first. These children could use interest centers, work on extra or special worksheets, peer tutor, read library books, or write on the board.

However, at the same time, some problems were noticed. For one thing, most teachers did <u>not</u> make provisions for the faster students. In 12 of the 23 classes observed, children were seen sitting around when their work was done or they were told to fold their hands, put their heads down, and not to talk. One teacher even warned, "Don't get ahead of me." Such practices serve simply to waste time for the children involved and do not further their learning (Chicago Public Schools Department of Research and Evaluation, 1986; Chicago School Watch, 1985). Another common problem was that interest centers were not observed in use in any classroom, and in 11 of the 23 classes no evidence indicated that they even existed. When teachers were asked how they used such centers, they replied that students could go there when they finished their work or they could use them during free play. There was little indication that the majority of the teachers knew how to set up and use learning centers as an integral part of their instruction. With such use, as has been suggested in various inservices, the centers provide an effective means of individualizing instruction and of providing motivation.

A third problem was the fact that no real writing--creative composition--was going on. Writing instruction consisted of workbook exercises on visual and auditory discrimination, practicing individual letters, learning to write one's own name, underwriting, overwriting, and, especially, copying. This latter exercise in the form of a "Morning Story" was seen in five classrooms. These handwriting and reading readiness skills

are necessary to make children literate, but composition skills, too, must become a vital part of the school curriculum. Recent research recommends that kindergartners be given open-ended writing tasks, with varied opportunities for individual exploration, in a rich and purposeful print environment (DeFord 1980; Dyson, 1985; Hipple, 1985; Klein and Schickedanz, 1980). One additional problem in connection with writing was seen in one classroom: children working on worksheets in their reading group had no place to write except the floor, the wall, or the backs of chairs and students.

Learning Environment

Almost all classrooms were orderly and tastefully decorated with displays. Children's own work and progress were in evidence in all but two cases, appealingly displayed as "Hot Dogs" or "They're Grrreat." Instructional displays ranged from the alphabet and numbers to the five senses and children's names and birthdates. Decorations were seasonal (turkeys, snowflakes), motivational (pictures of people helping others and of Chicago's mayor), or instructional (room helpers arranged on an octopus, pictures relating to field trips). The furniture consisted of small tables, desks arranged in groups or rows, and, in some cases, a piano, rocking chair, rugs, and a sand table. Although nine of the rooms were small primary rooms, the space could still be creatively arranged into areas by the use of the teacher's desk and storage shelves.

Several teachers mentioned the need of more storage areas. Other lacks were an activity room or gym for seven classes and a playground free of glass. Also, a few schools were in need of repair: paint was peeling, clocks were broken, windows were boarded up. Another problem noted in several classes was constant interruption: tardy pupils, parents, clerks, and miscellaneous adults wandering in and out apparently at will. However, in spite of these difficulties, the children for the most part were attentive. Their average time-on-task was 91 percent. ("Time-on-task" in this case means following the teacher's directions.) Children with a CPC background, who had had some previous school experience, were somewhat higher at 91.4 percent than the children with no preschool at 89.8 percent.

Parent Involvement

Parent involvement is an important aim of this Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten. If a parent (usually the mother) could not participate, grandparents or other relatives from the extended family were acceptable. Parent duties were varied, as revealed by observations and interviews with teachers, head teachers, and parent resource teachers. In the parent rooms parents made costumes, cooked special meals, made games and decorations, attended workshops on topics such as nutrition and consumer education, and attended GED, reading, math, and typing classes. They were taken on shopping trips, went on field trips with their children's classes, helped with parties or special projects. In class they tutored or supervised students, performed clerical tasks, assembled bulletin boards, helped with meals, escorted the children to lunch and gym, listened to children read, and played games with children.

Schools used varied strategies to elicit parent participation. Parents were sent notices and letters, called on the phone, invited to class meetings and personal conferences. Three schools gave them awards for their participation, and several teachers rewarded the children if their parents participated. One teacher set up individualized activities for parents and their children. In fact, when teachers were asked how they tried to increase parent involvement in their classrooms, many teachers indicated such a personal approach: telling parents that "we need them," personally contacting them on the phone, giving them specific duties after finding out what they were comfortable with. Parent participation was considerably higher for the CPCs than the parent-schools since the former were able to strictly require a certain level of participation (usually once a week). If the parents didn't cooperate, their children could be dropped from the program or their other children would not be accepted. According to the head teachers, parent participation for the CPCs was from 55 to 100 percent and for the parent schools from zero to 50 percent. Six parents were observed working in the classrooms and from seven to 20 in the parent rooms.

On their questionnaires teachers provided more information on parent involvement. Eighty-one percent of them said that they did have a parent duty-roster in their room. This percentage compares favorably with the 1984 figure of 64 percent. Furthermore, Table 6 presents the activities which teachers said they suggested to parents for use with their children at home. On the one hand, the top four figures indicate that teachers were concerned with the basics of reading, math, and self-concept. But, on the other hand, the lowest figures indicate areas which could do a lot to help children. Getting children a library card is a way to open up for them the joys of reading, and cooking with children appears to be associated with gain scores in both math and language (see Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten Program Evaluation Report for Fiscal 1984).

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS SUGGESTING ACTIVITIES FOR PARENTS TO DO AT HOME WITH THEIR CHILDREN

Activity	Percentage
Counting with child	100
Reading to child	90
Helping child learn the alphabet	90
Talking with child	90
Praising child	90
Going on outings with child	86
Checking homework	81
Playing and/or making games	71
Providing child with manipulatives, including art and writing supplies	67
Getting child a library card	62
Cooking with child	38

In order to find out parents' perceptions of the All-Day Kindergarten Program, they were asked at the end of the school year to fill out the Kindergarten Parent Questionnaire (Appendix D). These questionnaires were returned by 234 parents, for a return rate of 40 percent. Several classes were able to achieve a much higher return: Cole 102--97 percent, Melody 118 --84 percent, and Hansberry 104--73 percent.

The answers on the parent questionnaires revealed several interesting facets of the program. For one thing, parent communication with the schools was more clearly delineated. Although 88 percent of the parents described their communication with their children's schools as "excellent" or "good," 12 percent said it was "fair" or "poor." Nine of the classes of this latter group were in parent schools with the other four in CPCs. Furthermore, when asked whether the teachers had suggested ways to help their children at home, 34 percent of the parents answered "not this year" or "once or twice." About three times as many parent school parents answered this way as CPC parents. An obvious implication is that parent schools must work harder to involve their kindergarten parents, although in an ideal situation no parents would be answering such questions negatively.

TABLE 7

PERCENT OF PARENT PARTICIPATION IN CHAPTER 2 ALL-DAY KINDERGARTENS

	Child-Parent Centers				Parent School Kindergartens			
	Not this Year	Once or Twice	Several times 1985	1984	Not this Year	Once or Twice	Several times 1984	1985
Participation in parent room activities	14	23	63*		41	34	25*	
Teacher suggested ways to help child at home	2	19	79*	68	7	38	55*	51
Visited class	-	14	86*	76	1	38	62*	67
Talked with teacher about child	-	12	88*	79	1	39	60*	62
Helped child with homework	1	7	92	95	2	11	88	86
Did volunteer work in class	13	17	70*	51	55	26	19*	18
Attended parent meetings at school	6	25	70*	61	34	41	25*	29

Number: CPC parents 100-103
Parent school kindergarten parents 122-123

*These differences between types of parents are very significant (at the .0002 level or better)

Table 7 sets forth parents' answers to seven items on their questionnaire about their participation in school activities. It compares CPC and parent school parents and also includes 1984 figures in the "several times" column. The data in this table reflects improvement in general in the CPCs. There was an increase of almost 20 percentage points in the CPC parents saying that they did volunteer work in their children's classroom "several times." As last year's analysis showed, a significant difference appeared between the gain scores of CPC children whose parents volunteered in their classroom "several times" and those whose parents were only slightly involved. These differences were 3-4 months and appeared in the areas of vocabulary and language (Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten Program Evaluation Report for Fiscal 1984). On the other hand, the parent school kindergartens did not fare so well. Although the decline in participation levels from 1984 to 1985 was not as large as the mean decline of 19 percent from 1983 to 1984, the net result this year was still down. Especially disheartening were the 55 percent of parents saying they did no volunteer work in class and the 45 percent saying that the teachers suggested ways to help their children at home not at all or only once or twice.

Table 8 shows the kind and amount of help parents said they gave their children at home. Several areas improved in general from 1984 to 1985: helping with handwriting, cooking with child, providing art and writing supplies, and, for CPC parents, getting child a library card. No areas seemed to show an important decline, except for getting child a library card in the case of parent school parents. A final interesting point in connection with these answers is that when parents were asked to list "other" ways in which they helped their children at home, four percent mentioned worthwhile reading activities: buying books for the child to read, subscribing to book clubs, listening to tapes of books, taking the child to the library, and letting the child read to the parent.

TABLE 8

PERCENT OF PARENTS SAYING YES TO HELPING THEIR CHILDREN AT HOME

Type of Help	Child-Parent Center	Parent School Kind.	Total Sample 1984
Read to child	91	91	94
Played reading or math games	75	64	66
Checked homework	99	99	92
Helped with hand-writing	92	93	84
Went on outings with child	75	61	65
Cooked with child	59	54	46
Counted with child	97	94	93
Made games	63	53	50
Praised child	84	74	81
Talked with child	100	98	97
Provided art and writing supplies	87	83	78
Got child library card	30	11	21
Watched TV with child	91	96	89
Helped child with alphabet	97	97	95

EVALUATION

Pupil Attendance

Table 9 shows the pupil attendance rate for the Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergartens during fiscal 1985 according to principals' summaries. For comparison purposes, figures are also given for 1982 (when the kindergartens at these schools were half-day), for the second semester of 1983 (when these kindergartens became all-day), for 1984, and for kindergartens citywide.

TABLE 9

CHAPTER 2 ALL-DAY KINDERGARTEN PUPIL ATTENDANCE

School	Attendance Rates (Percents) Half-Day 1982	All-Day 1983	All-Day 1984	All-Day 1985
CPC Kindergartens				
Miller	92	95	95	93
Dickens	90	93	89	93
Olive	91	92	88	92
Hansberry	96	94	93	94
Cole	96	96	94	97
Wheatley	93	93	90	95
Averages	94	94	92	94
Parent School Kindergartens				
Jensen	85	95	93	96
King	87	96	87	90
Henson	85	92	88	88
Webster	84	95	92	92
Summer/Melody*	88	89	92	94
Carver	87	92	88	89
Averages	86	93	90	91
Citywide		90	89	90

*Melody became the parent school of Cole CPC in September 1983.

In general the Chapter 2 Kindergarten pupil attendance rate has remained fairly constant during the three years of the program's operation with 1985 an improvement over 1984. The CPC attendance is higher than the parent school attendance, as would be expected, but the latter improved considerably from the half-day to the all-day program. Most important, both rates have been higher than the citywide rates for all years. The Chapter 2 rates according to principals' summaries were corroborated closely by the classroom observations.

Teacher Attendance

Teacher attendance rates for the Chapter 2 Kindergarten teachers were examined from the teacher attendance file constructed by the Technical Services Bureau of the Department of Research and Evaluation. Their overall percent of absent days was 3.82, with a range of days absent from 0 to 14. The percent of absent days for the same schools not including kindergartens was 4.85, and for 880 kindergarten teachers throughout the city (essentially all in the system) it was 4.81. Thus the Chaper 2 All-Day Kindergarten teachers, like their pupils, had an above-average rate of attendance.

Achievement Outcomes

The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS), Level 5: Early Primary Battery, standardized untimed power tests given orally, were administered to Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten students in October 1984 as a pretest and again in May 1985 as a posttest. In these tests the pupils mark a letter or picture according to the teacher's instructions. Table 10 describes the five subtests.

TABLE 10

SUBTESTS OF IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS, LEVEL 5: EARLY PRIMARY BATTERY

Name of Subtest	Approximate Time Needed	Areas Measured	Specific Skills Tested
Listening	25 min.	Verbal ability, comprehension, linguistic ability	Literal meaning, inferential meaning, concept development, following directions, understanding sequence, predicting outcomes, attention span
Vocabulary	20 min.	Word meaning, concept development	Meaning of nouns, verbs, and modifiers
Word Analysis	25 min.	Decoding skills involving knowledge of grapheme-phoneme relationships	Letter recognition, letter-sound correspondence, initial sounds, final sounds, rhyming sounds
Language	20 min.	Comprehension of linguistic relationships, ways in which language is used to express ideas	Classification, prepositions, verb tense, singular-plural, comparative-superlative, relationships among subject/verb/object/modifier
Mathematics	25 min.	Numeration and number systems, geometry and measurement, operations	Numeral recognition, counting, one-to-one correspondence, ordinals, fractions, series, comparisons, measurement, shapes, money, addition, subtraction

In Table 11 the overall results on these subtests are depicted for both 1984 and 1985. Scores are given only for students who took both pre and posttests. From these results it can be seen that these children on the pretest were below norms (K.2) in all areas, except for word analysis in 1985. By the posttest they were at or above norms (K.8) in word analysis and math. In six months of instruction they had achieved from six to nine months growth in 1984 and from five to eight months in 1985. In both years the weakest areas were vocabulary and language; in these areas the children were lowest on both the pretest and the posttest and made the smallest gains.

TABLE 11

OVERALL RESULTS ON THE IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS, LEVEL 5
FOR CHAPTER 2 ALL-DAY KINDERGARTEN

		Grade Equivalent Medians					
	Number	October Median		May Median		Median Gain	
Subtest	(matched results)	1985	1984	1985	1984	1985	1984
Vocabulary	515	P.7	P.7	K.5	K.5	0.6	0.6
Word Analysis	517	K.3	P.7	1.1	1.1	0.7	0.9
Language	513	P.8	P.8	K.3	K.7	0.5	0.7
Math	511	P.9	P.9	K.8	K.8	0.8	0.8
Listening	518	P.8		K.7		0.7	

P = preschool, K= kindergarten

An important observation about these overall scores is that posttest and gain score medians in language were lower in 1985 than in 1984. The reasons for this situation might be three. For one thing, alarmed by reports of malpractice in school testing, the Citywide Testing Bureau of the Department of Research and Evaluation instituted in 1985 more stringent measures of test monitoring. Warnings and suggestions were published in the Chicago Public Schools General Bulletin; each district was asked to formulate its own plan for its testing procedure; and Citywide Testing sent out notices on the proper procedure for administering a standardized test. Although this monitoring only applied to grades one through eight, kindergarten teachers might have been aware of the building-wide concern to the point of using more than the usual care in their own administration. That there is room for improvement in kindergarten testing is shown by Wodtke et al. (1985). In this study of testing practices in eight kindergartens, procedures in five of the eight classes were "so unstandardized as to render their test scores incomparable and quite possibly unreliable" (p.1).

The cause of the lower language scores might be partly in the scaling of that subtest: the grade distributions are such that one additional item missed results in a lower score of three or more months in grade equivalents. A third important point is that language is a particularly weak area for disadvantaged children. They enter preschool at a very low level of development and are still low at the end of a second year of preschool. On the four-year-old pre-kindergarten criterion-referenced tests in both 1984 and 1985, the four areas showing the lowest percentage of mastery (less than 80 percent) all had to do with describing and explaining objects and concepts (Mavis Hagemann, "Summary Report of EARLY Assessment," presentation at CPC Head Teachers Meeting, January 17, 1986). These test results should have implications for the curriculum at the preschool and kindergarten levels. Language development must be emphasized more strongly, including oral language, writing (composition), and holistic reading activities.

Table 12 compares the Chapter 2 CPC and parent-school scores and also includes scores for all the other CPCs besides Chapter 2. When the CPCs are compared, the Chapter 2 classes come out fairly well. These classes in May were the highest of all groups in word analysis, math, and listening medians and equal to the other CPCs in vocabulary and language medians. In math they scored particularly high. They also made the highest median gains in word analysis, math, and listening. However, a weak spot for Chapter 2 CPCs seems to be vocabulary: these students began in October equal to the parent schools (in spite of more preschool) and were lower in both October and gain score medians than the other CPCs. Although all groups were at or above norms on the posttest in word analysis and math, they were below norms in vocabulary, language, and listening.

The group that stands out is the parent school kindergartens. They began lowest, as expected, in all areas except vocabulary, but they ended up the lowest only in word analysis and language. Their gain score medians were higher than all others in language and equal to or higher than one of the CPC groups in all other areas. In six months of instruction, the Chapter 2 CPCs gained five to nine months, the other CPCs five to seven months, and the parent school kindergartens six to eight months. When 1984 and 1985 Chapter 2 median gains are compared in vocabulary, word analysis, language and math, CPC gains went down in all areas, but the parent school gains were down only in language and word analysis and up in vocabulary and math.

TABLE 12

RESULTS ON THE IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS, LEVEL 5:
KINDERGARTEN GROUPS COMPARED

Subtest and Group	Number (matched scores)	Grade Equivalent Statistics October Median	May Median	Median Gain 1985	1984
Vocabulary					
Ch. 2 CPCs	204	P.7	K.5	0.6	0.7
Ch. 2 Parent school kind.	311	P.7	K.5	0.6	0.5
All CPCs excluding Ch. 2	778	P.8	K.5	0.7	
Word Analysis					
Ch. 2 CPCs	206	K.4	1.2	0.8	0.9
Ch. 2 Parent school kind.	311	K.3	1.0	0.7	0.9
All CPCs excluding Ch. 2	573	K.5	1.1	0.6	
Language					
Ch. 2 CPCs	204	P.8	K.3	0.5	0.8
Ch. 2 Parent school kind.	309	P.7	K.2	0.6	0.7
All CPCs excluding Ch. 2	576	P.8	K.3	0.5	
Math					
Ch. 2 CPCs	205	K.0	1.0	0.8	1.0
Ch. 2 Parent school kind.	306	P.8	K.8	0.8	0.7
All CPCs excluding Ch. 2	576	K.0	K.8	0.7	
Listening					
Ch. 2 CPCs	208	P.8	K.7	0.9	
Ch. 2 Parent school kind.	310	P.7	K.6	0.7	
All CPCs excluding Ch. 2	576	P.8	K.6	0.7	

A comparison of individual rooms reveals two special groups. Those that gained one year or more in various areas either had classes composed of the best children in terms of ability, had scores out of line (gains of two years or over), or had teachers who were creative, organized, caring, well able to utilize parent help and every minute of the class day. On the other hand, some rooms showed small gains (from no gain to five months). These rooms tended to have teachers who were noted during the observations (and in many cases confirmed by the head teachers) as being cold, strict, structured, disorganized, rigid, and/or exclusively utilizing whole-group instruction.

Parent Involvement and Children's Test Results

Students' ITBS scores were analyzed in several ways to see if their parents' involvement in their schools made a difference. The two questions on the parent questionnaire which were used in this analysis asked 1) how often parents volunteered in the classroom and 2) how often they participated in activities in the parent rooms. For analytical purposes, the parents were divided for each separate question into two groups: those who were more active and those who were less active, as indicated in their responses to the two questions. The children of the active vs. the inactive parents were compared. That is, ITBS gain scores were compared for children of CPC parents (active vs. inactive) and for children of parent school parents (active vs. inactive). In addition, the scores of several subgroups of children were analyzed separately: 1) those children with gain scores in the lowest and in the highest quartiles; and 2) the gain scores for those children below and those children above grade level on the pretest.

The findings were not entirely consistent. The differences in the gain scores ($p<.10$ or less) between children whose parents were active and those whose parents were not active in school were in both directions. Sometimes the children of active parents made greater gains than the children of non-active parents. However, the situation was sometimes reversed: children of non-active parents made greater gains than children of active parents. In spite of this inconsistency, children of active parents were approximately twice as likely to gain more through the school year than children of non-active parents. This finding holds true for both the lower children (those with gain scores in the lowest quartile and those below grade level on the pretest) and for the higher children (those with gain scores in the highest quartile and those at or above grade level on the pretest).

A further analysis investigated the effect of both school type (CPC vs. parent school) and level of parental activity in the classroom (active vs. inactive) on children's pre and post ITBS scores. In the case of the CPCs, those children whose parents were active scored significantly better on the pretest in math and word analysis than those children whose parents were inactive. However, for these children there were no significant differences on the posttest between those whose parents were active and those whose parents were inactive. The case of the parent school children was different. A significant difference ($p<.05$) appeared between the post scores of these children whose parents were active and those whose parents were only slightly involved. This difference was in favor of parental activity and consisted of four months higher scores in the areas of language and word analysis.

These results become important when they are considered along with last year's findings. Then, a significant difference appeared between the gain scores of the CPC children whose parents were active in the classroom and those whose parents were inactive. This difference was 3-4 months more gain for children of active parents in vocabulary and language (Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten Program Final Evaluation Report Fiscal 1984). The constant in both years' findings is the effect of parental involvement in the classroom on language. Increased chances for children's interaction with adults, often on a one-to-one basis, would seem to affect their performance on the ITBS language subtest. This subtest deals with children's comprehension of the

ideas expressed in language, such as classification of objects, spatial and temporal relationships, comparatives and superlatives. Certainly children's experience with adults, especially in a learning situation, is a major means of extending their language and thinking skills. Children from a disadvantaged background would seem to need such experience more than other children.

For the second year, our findings indicate that classroom participation by parents affects their children's learning. This effect is particularly evident in the children's weakest area of language and can amount to four months' greater growth, as measured by the ITBS, for children whose parents are active than for children whose parents are inactive. In addition, parent school children seem especially affected by parents in their classrooms. Since they are coming to school for the first time and have not had a two-year possibility for their parents' classroom participation, perhaps they are seen leaping forward all at once because they are at the right readiness level, instead of developing more slowly over a longer period.

Several additional analyses dealt with larger sets of questions from the parent questionnaires. Seven questions asked parents how much they had participated at their children's schools. In the analysis of each question parents were separated into two groups: 1) those who said they had not participated at all and 2) those who said they had participated several times or more. The gain scores for children whose parents belonged to these two groups were then compared to see if they differed significantly. With respect to two questions, significant differences ($p \leq .07$) appeared in the two groups' mean scores: 1) how often parents had been to school in connection with their children's kindergarten and 2) whether they had volunteered in the classroom. The differences appeared in the listening subtest for the first question and in the two subtests of listening and word analysis for the second question in favor of more parental involvement. Again, the importance of parents volunteering in the classroom is suggested.

One set of 14 questions asked parents what they did with their children at home. For each question parents were again divided into two groups: those who said they had conducted the activity and those who said they had not conducted the activity. The gain scores for children whose parents belonged to these two groups were again compared to see if they differed significantly. Fifteen significant differences ($p < .10$) appeared for the five subtests. Twelve of these significant differences were in the expected direction: that is, children who had done the activity with their parents made significantly higher test scores than children who had not done the activity.

Reading to children seemed to be a particularly effective activity: significant differences appeared in the three subtests of vocabulary, language, and listening. Other important activities were providing children with art and writing supplies and getting children library cards. For each of these activities significant differences appeared for both the mathematics and listening subtests. Cooking with children, praising children, and playing reading and math games with children also made a difference in listening

scores. These activities, then, would appear to be related to children's improved performance on the ITBS:

--reading to children (especially)

--providing children with art and writing supplies

--getting children library cards

--cooking with children

--praising children

--playing reading and math games with children.

It seems apparent that those children who have been fortunate enough to have parents who have provided them with such activities and teachers who have coordinated the activities with their curriculum have made significantly higher test scores in several areas than children whose parents and teachers have not stressed such activities.

Affective Growth

Since a major goal of the All-Day Kindergarten Program is to foster growth in affective as well as cognitive areas, a means had to be devised to measure such growth. In response to this need, staff from the Department of Research and Evaluation developed an Affective Rating Scale (Appendix A). This instrument was filled out by classroom teachers on each child in October 1984, as a pretest, and again in June 1985, as a posttest. The scale consists of 30 items related to the child's social skills, emotional stability, feelings about school activities, and possession of skills necessary in grade one. The teachers were to circle numbers ranging from 1, never, to 7, always. They were instructed to observe the children for a period of time before rating them. Matched results were available for 505 children.

An analysis of the ratings on these scales showed that the average improvement for all children on all items was 37 percent, according to teachers' estimates. The average loss on all items was 27 percent, with 36 percent the average of "no change." Thus, according to the Affective Rating Scale Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten children seem to have experienced affective growth during their year in kindergarten. The largest percentages of improvement were shown for social skills (getting along with and helping others) and for skills necessary for first grade (concentration, independence, responsibility, following directions, effort). The largest percentages of improvement appeared at Dickens CPC, a bilingual group, and at King and Jensen, parent schools. Another analysis correlated children's gains on the Affective Rating Scale with gains on the ITBS. Extremely modest positive correlations (in the .20's) appeared in connection with the word analysis subtest. Positive correlations appearing in word analysis might reflect the fact that word analysis is the area in which these Chapter 2 kindergartners scored the highest on the spring ITBS posttest (Table 11).

Teacher Perceptions

According to their answers on their questionnaires (Appendix C), the teachers felt that the main strength of the All-Day Kindergarten Program was that it allowed more time for a variety of activities. This point was mentioned by all but one of the 21 teachers who returned their questionnaires, or 95 percent. More time was available to work with the whole child and also with individuals, to enhance the curriculum in new areas and provide enrichment activities, to teach the basics and work on thinking and problem-solving tasks and listening skills. Another strength mentioned by four teachers was that this All-Day Program exposed disadvantaged children to a new environment and helped to make up for deficits in their backgrounds.

As for drawbacks to All-Day Kindergarten, 38 percent of the teachers either said there were none or mentioned none. The most frequent problem mentioned by 33 percent of the teachers was that all children were not mature enough to adjust to the All-Day Program. When asked on their questionnaires how many children they had who were not ready for first grade, ten teachers answered a median number of four (range 1-10). The reasons the children were not ready were that they hadn't mastered basic skills, they had emotional problems, or they had other learning deficits such as poor eye/hand coordination or not understanding English which would qualify them for special classes. Another significant problem mentioned by five teachers was that too much formal workbook-type learning was expected. There was too much pressure for success, not enough playtime, too much teacher talk. Four teachers mentioned a lack of adequate space for quiet corners or interest centers. One thoughtful comment was that "due to the shorter attention span of children this age and with the increased amount of time, there is a need for a greater amount of preparation time to supply them with added activities to provide movement and variety in the presentation of skills to be taught."

Aide Perceptions

According to their questionnaires (Appendix E), all 17 aides who returned this instrument appeared to feel positively about the program. In their open-ended answers none had a negative remark. They mentioned their close relationships with the teachers and how both the children and the parents appeared to grow. They felt that this "excellent" and "well-constructed" program should be expanded.

Parent Perceptions

When parents were asked their reactions to All-Day Kindergarten, 97 percent of the 234 who returned their questionnaires (Appendix D) said their children enjoyed school during 1985, 98 percent said they liked the program, and 96 percent were satisfied with what their children had learned. Furthermore, 94 percent said their children became more self-confident during the year, 90 percent that their children grew a great deal, 92 percent that their children were more independent, and 97 percent that they concentrated better. Only four percent said their children became too tired as a result of attending kindergarten. Table 13 shows the differences, some significant,

between the answers of CPC and parent school parents to five questions having to do with skills necessary for first grade. According to these answers, CPC children were reported as growing significantly more than parent school children in self-confidence and in ability to concentrate and finish work; they also were said to have learned more in preschool. Such differences indicate the benefits of more than one year of preschool for disadvantaged children.

In the section for open-ended comments, parents gave specific reasons why they liked Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten. Most (58 percent) stated that it offered more time for learning--not just basic skills but also skills necessary for first grade such as concentration, dependability, getting along with others, following directions, self-control and self-awareness. Many parents complimented their children's teachers as being hard-working, caring, and understanding. Many also admitted that All-Day Kindergarten was good for

---

TABLE 13

DIFFERENCES BY GROUPS IN PARENTS' ANSWERS TO FIVE QUESTIONS (PERCENTAGES)

Question (referring to "last year")	Child Parent Centers Less	No Change	Little More	Much More	Parent School Kindergartens Less	No Change	Little More	Much More
Change in child's - self-confidence	2	14	84*	1	8	22	69*	
Change in child's 1 ability to work and play with other children	7	9	84	2	9	16	74	
Change in child's - ability to be independent	5	20	75	2	9	23	66	
Change in child's 1 ability to concentrate and finish work	2	22	75*	-	2	38	59*	
	Little	Moderate amount	Great amount		Little	Moderate amount	Great amount	
How much has child learned in preschool	1	7	92*		5	19	76*	

*These differences between types of parents are significant at the .01 level or better

---

parents too. It helped them if they worked, gave them time alone or with their other children, and allowed them to go to school themselves. In addition, parents said that their classroom visitations helped them learn methods of working with their children at home and thus develop closer parent/child communication. Some interesting specific parent comments about All-Day Kindergarten were "Thank God for kindergarten"; "He and I can communicate better"; "She's excited about learning"; "I'm so proud of her"; and "When I read him a story, he can explain the whole story back to me."

Only 19 parents (eight percent) made negative comments, either as complaints or suggestions. Several had to do with the academic program. Two parents felt that there was too much phonics. Another two thought their children could have been taught more, such as a second language or the use of computers, and one requested that teachers enforce homework more. On the other hand, one parent mentioned too much formal learning--five-year-olds need time out for other activities such as gym. Summer school (in the CPCs) elicited varied reactions: on the positive side, parent school parents asking for it as a means of picking up what had not been learned during the regular school year and, on the negative side, a complaint that it interfered with summer vacation. Other dissatisfactions had to do with too many children in the class, the wrong placement of a CPC child in a parent school class, and poor communication about graduation procedures. One parent wished that "more parents would come out to see how their children are doing."

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the evidence presented in this report, the following conclusions are drawn and recommendations made in order to improve and strengthen the Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten Program.

1. Because test results consistently show these educationally disadvantaged children to be lowest in vocabulary and language, holistic language activities should replace the predominant fragmented ditto sheet approach. Such activities have the advantages of developing vocabulary and language naturally and also of promoting two essential conditions for the development of human learning: 1) motivation, and 2) transfer of behavior to contexts outside of school (Tyler, 1986). Amongst mountains of worksheets these two crucial learning conditions often get lost.

    a. The most important recommendation is for every teacher to read aloud to the class or to groups of individuals every day. As the national Commission on Reading (1985) concluded, the single most important activity for building the knowledge required for eventual success in reading is reading aloud to children. This is especially so during the preschool years. The benefits are greatest when the child is an active participant, engaging in discussions about stories, learning to identify letters and words, and talking about the meaning of words (p. 23).

    Teachers should not only read aloud books which the children bring in but also traditional children's folk tales (the Brothers Grimm and Hans Christian Andersen) and Newbery and Caldecott award-winning books. Practice before reading should enhance the dramatic qualities of the reading. The teacher might pose questions before reading so children can listen for answers to these questions and ask further questions as the reading progresses. Children might discuss whether they like the stories, compare them to other books, write about them, act them out, draw pictures about them. Thus children are taught that "books can tell you about exciting things, things you care about" (Chicago School Watch, p. 35). They learn vocabulary, literary forms, sentence and text structure, and knowledge about the world (Commission on Reading, 1985).

    b. Kindergarten children should participate in uninterrupted sustained silent reading. On some days the teacher can read to the class and on other days children can read picture books themselves; if they cannot read the print, they can read the pictures and tell the story to a partner.

    c. More use should be made of libraries. Volunteers or older children might read to individual kindergartners in the library. A field trip might be planned to the public library, with parents, so children can hear storytellers, get library cards, and check out books. Parents should be urged to take their children to the library and get them library cards. Children should be allowed and encouraged to take books home, either from their classroom or from the school library. Books, after all, have more to do with reading than worksheets do.

d. Parents might be brought into holistic reading activities. They can sign contracts to read with their children at home. As was tried at Hansberry, parents can read books and then make up activities for children involving those books. Children might wear tags home saying "Please read to me." A corner of the school library might be set aside for books for parents to check out to read to their children. In class parents can listen to children read their own writing as well as books and also read and write to the children themselves.

e. The extensive use of ditto and workbook sheets, which often involve phonics, handwriting, and mechanics, should be cut drastically. For one thing, phonics and letter knowledge are a necessary part of reading instruction, but they are only relatively small parts of a total reading program (Chicago School Watch, 1985). Furthermore, reading and writing are complex tasks which develop in different ways in different people. Worksheets are not the best way to teach these skills. They are developmentally inappropriate for five-year-olds and may even make children think of reading and writing as worthless activities (Seefeldt, 1985). A concentration on the basic skills of reading and math should not preclude a wide variety of activities, some involving play and free choice.

f. Language experience stories help children effect a smooth transition from speech to print. More teachers should write down children's own stories, letters, or lists and then read them back to the children and point out letters, words, and sentences. In this way children begin to notice likenesses and differences in letters and words and come to understand the relationship between oral and written language (Seefeldt, 1985).

g. Another way to integrate general aspects of language is for children to compose text meaningful to them. The Commission on Reading (1985) recommends that writing activities be incorporated into all classes. The usual tasks of kindergarten writing instruction--copying the "Morning Story" and tracing letters and numerals--focus only on individual letters (Dyson, 1985). However, there is much more to writing than knowing how to form letters, such as linearity, directionality, word to word correspondence between writing and speech, and, especially, meaning. Therefore, kindergartners should be given open-ended writing tasks such as journals and letters in which they write however they are able. The only requirement is that they be able to read back what they have written; spelling, grammar, and punctuation are not important. All that is needed are desks and chairs and availability of writing supplies: paper, pens, felt-tip markers, pencils, crayons, chalk. Such learning by trial and error resembles the natural way that children learn to speak and also permits individual exploration so that they learn to plan and encode messages and produce appropriate graphics (DeFord, 1980; Hipple, 1985; Klein and Schickedanz, 1980).

h. Children need more opportunities to express themselves orally, instead of just listening to the teacher talking. "Show and Tell" is one way to encourage oral expression in a context which is meaningful to the children. Other recommended activities are songs, poems, finger play, puppetry, and dramatization of stories which have been read aloud. One experimental study (Henderson, 1986) found that four, five, and six-year-olds who dramatized stories after hearing them read were able after 12 weeks to present the stories at the highest levels of conceptual complexity. Only 10 percent of their dramatizations were at the lowest levels, as opposed to 74 percent in the control groups, who had done no dramatizations after hearing the stories. Such dramatizations seemed to help children's knowledge of stories as well as their thinking skills.

i. All language tasks should be more concerned with higher-level thinking skills. Books should be summarized and compared. While reading stories teachers should ask questions requiring prediction and determining cause and effect. At lunch foods can be categorized and a discussion of different cultures' food and food preparation could focus on cause and effect. A recent observation in a suburban kindergarten revealed how such higher-order skills might be incorporated into any lesson. On the 100th day of school, children were to bring in 100 things. As the children explained orally what they had brought in, the teacher categorized the objects on the board (food, toys, wood, money, etc.) and explained the new vocabulary (e.g. pinto beans, coffee beans, navy beans). Then the children worked in pairs and each put one of his/her objects on mats with 100 squares.

2. As the analyses of parent involvement have shown, there is room for improvement in this area, especially for the parent school parents. Since family involvement results in positive attitudes toward school, success in school, and persistence to graduate from school (Stallings and Stipek, 1986), the urgency becomes even greater.

a. All teachers must be in contact with all parents and guide them in helping their children. Parents need and want such guidance. Test score gains show that home learning activities help children to increase significantly their scores on standardized tests of reading, reasoning, and visual-aural skills (Rich, 1985). A particularly beneficial suggestion would be for parents to cook with children. Measuring ingredients helps math, following directions helps reading, new ingredients and terms help vocabulary, working cooperatively helps social studies, not to mention the delight in making something good to share. Other suggestions for parents have to do with reading: sharing books with children, subscribing to book clubs, taking children to the library to get them a library card and to check out books, participating in family story times, setting up a special area in the house for reading and storing books. Parents should provide writing materials for children, write notes back and forth to their children, and give the whole family rewards for reading or writing instead of watching television (Holbrook, 1985; Rich, 1985). In one Chicago school the principal took the lead in getting parents to pledge that their children would read at home 20 minutes each night. Sixty percent of the parents made such a pledge.

b. For both class and home, teachers must devise individualized activities for parents just as they do for children. An example would be for teachers to assign discussion about television programs and invite the parents to come to school to watch a program. After parents and their children talk about the program, teachers then supply related reading materials (Holbrook, 1985).

c. We have seen that differences appear in the gain scores of children whose parents work in the classroom and those whose parents do not work in the classroom, last year in vocabulary and language and this year in word analysis and language. Other studies also show that child achievement is influenced specifically by parents in the role of teaching their own children (Stallings and Stipek, 1986). Therefore, schools and teachers should work especially hard to get parents to help in the classrooms. They can invite parents to talk about their jobs, have parents write and bind books to read to their children, make videotapes for parents on how to help their children, and have their classes write a skit or play to motivate parents to come to the classroom (Holbrook, 1985).

3. In order to promote affective growth, teachers might concentrate more heavily on activities designed for this purpose. For instance, <u>all</u> teachers should require children to help out as much as possible in the classroom--during lunch and morning exercises, tutoring slower children, collecting and distributing materials, leading games, performing errands. Children might role play situations involving people in need of help or discuss newspaper articles or books which exhibit prosocial behavior. Teachers themselves should model sharing and helping behavior and recognize and reward examples of caring, helping and responsibility (Brown and Solomon, 1983). Rules for appropriate social behavior should make clear the reasoning behind such rules, and the consequences of misbehavior should be thoroughly stated in advance. Punishment for misbehavior does not have to be heavy but should be consistent and immediate (Roedell et al., 1976).

4. As our observations have confirmed, the amount of time spent learning in many classrooms is as low as 30 percent (Chicago School Watch, 1985). Faster children who finish their work first, in particular, need more to do than fold their hands and put their heads on the table. A special "Bag of Activities" might be made up for them; library books with special activities could be provided; they could peer tutor and help the teacher prepare, collect, and distribute materials. In poorly organized rooms, while children at their desks do workbook pages, teachers grade homework, look for supplies, or discipline. Teachers who meet the needs of all students have prepared adequate and individualized materials for all levels. Effective teachers "come well-prepared to teach. They don't spend class time finding materials, setting up equipment, and getting organized. Disorganized teachers invite misbehavior" (Chicago School Watch, 1985, p. 25). Effective teachers prepare materials and grade homework out of class. Work is ready for children as soon as they arrive. Transitions are made quickly and efficiently. The teacher moves around the room to keep all students alert and interested. Discipline is maintained without stopping teaching (Chicago Public Schools Department of Research and Evaluation, 1986).

5. Some children should probably be retained in a special pre-first grade class. The teachers on their questionnaires rated 29 children as not being ready for first grade. Their reasons for such a rating were varied: some children were immature, unable to work independently, with short attention spans and little concentration; others were discipline problems; and some had special problems such as not understanding English or poor eye-hand coordination. Therefore, such a class must be kept small to provide individual attention. As a recent review of research on early childhood education has concluded, longitudinal studies suggest that "retention in grade may increase the chances of success for the low-achieving student and thus reduce the chances that students at risk will be placed in special education classes" (Stallings and Stipek, 1986, p. 728).

6. Since so little time seems to be spent in these All-Day Kindergarten classes on social studies and science, teachers might want to correlate these subjects into reading so that kindergartners are exposed to them. In one class, as pictures were shown in connection with beginning consonant sounds, for instance, there were discussions of log cabins, mammals and egg-laying animals, the characteristics of lions, and the origin and spread of fire as well as comparisons of different plant leaves, fruits, and animals (Chicago Public Schools Department of Research and Evaluation, 1986).

7. Small rooms do not preclude effective arrangement into sections for different groups. Cupboards, shelves, bookcases, desks, and tables might be used as dividers. Different moods can be created in different sections: a carpeted area with games for free-choice time; a listening-reading area with a tape recorder, books, and cushions; a writing area with desks and a table full of supplies.

8. Inservices for teachers should be very practical, relating specifically to classroom needs. Make-and-take sessions are popular. An insevice involving visitations to other classrooms and schools would make teachers aware of new approaches and activities.

9. All teachers should utilize their aides in a way to promote individualization of instruction. With proper training, aides can do more than clerical tasks and disciplining.

SUMMARY

The Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten Program has numerous strengths: on the ITBS, children gain in most areas from six to eight months of growth in six months of instruction; children grow in affective as well as cognitive areas; both pupil and teacher attendance is better than citywide rates; parents become involved in their children's learning; teachers provide an attractive learning environment and are continually inserviced by administrative staff; materials and supplies are generally adequately available. There are, however, areas for improvement, as the preceding recommendations show. The urgency for such improvement is great. As the review of early childhood research in the recent Handbook of Research on Teaching emphasizes, "The returns to society for the cost of preschool education are great" (Stallings and Stipek, 1986, p. 732). These returns include lower incidence of school dropouts, more likelihood of high school graduation, reduced costs for special education, increased life earnings for the participants, and reduced costs for incarceration. Thus preschool education benefits "not only an individual child, but also the family, school system, and society by assisting its participants to become more succesful members of society" (p. 738).

REFERENCES

Brown, D. and D. Solomon. "A Model for Prosocial Learning: An In-Progress Field Study" in D.L. Bridgeman, ed. The Nature of Prosocial Behavior. NY: Academic Press, 1983.

Chicago Public Schools. Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten Program Final Evaluation Report Fiscal 1984. Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1985.

Chicago Public Schools Department of Research and Evaluation. Special Study: A Close Look at Eight Kindergarten Classrooms. Chicago: Chicago Public Schools, 1986.

Chicago School Watch. All Our Kids Can Learn To Read: Guide to Parent and Citizen Action. Chicago: Designs for Change, 1985.

Commission on Reading. Becoming a Nation of Readers. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1985.

DeFord, Diane E. "Young Children and Their Writing. "Theory into Practice 19, Summer 1980, 157-162.

Dyson, Anne H. "Three Emergrants Writers and The School Curriculum: Copying and Other Myths. "The Elementary School Journal 85, March 1985, 497-512.

Hagemann, M. "Summary Report of EARLY Assessment." Presentation at CPC Head Teachers meeting, January 17, 1986.

Henderson, Harold. "What Did You Learn at School Today, Teacher?" The Reader, March 28, 1986, pp. 1 ff.

Hipple, M.L. "Journal Writing in Kindergarten." Language Arts 62, March 1985, 255-61.

Holbrook, H.T. "ERIC/RCS Report: Teachers Working with Parents." Language Arts 62, December 1985, 897-901.

Klein, Amelia and Judith Schickedanz. "Preschoolers Write Messages and Receive Their Favorite Books." Language Arts 57, October 1980, 742-749.

Rich, D. The Forgotten Factor in School Success: The Family. Washington, Language Arts 57, D.C.: Home and School Institute, 1985. October 1980, 742-749

Roedell, W.C., et al. Social Development in Young Children. Washington: National Institute of Education, 1976.

Seefeldt, C. "Tomorrow's Kindergarten: Pleasure or Pressure? "Principal 64, May 1985, 12-15.

Stallings, J.A. and Stipek, D. "Research on Early Childhood and Elementary School Teaching Programs" in M.C. Wittrock, ed. Handbook of Research on Teaching. Third Edition. NY: Macmillan, 1986.

Tyler, R.W. "Program Evaluation". International Journal of Education Research 10, n.1, 1986, 53-67.

Wodtke, K.H. et al. "The Mismeasure of Young Children: Is There Malpractice in Early School Testing?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1985.

APPENDIX A

Department of Research and Evaluation
Bureau of ECIA Program Evaluation

Chapter 2 ALL-DAY KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM FY 1985

Affective Rating Scale

Student's Name: _____

I.D.#: _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Sex: M F

School Name: _____ Unit #: _ _ _ _ Room #_ _ _

Directions: Please circle the number which describes most accurately your judgment about the observable bahavior of each child. The range of the scale is from 1, "never", to 7, "always". Space is available at the end of the scale for any necessary explanations. Return completed form before June 20th to your head teacher. Thank you for your cooperation.

	Always		Sometimes				Never
1. Likes number work	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
2. Likes reading and reading readiness activities	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
3. Is happy in school	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
4. Help others	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
5. Has trouble getting along with others	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
6. Concentrates on assigned activities	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
7. Asks questions about work in an alert way	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
8. Attends regularly	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
9. Comes to school late	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
10. Works independently when required to do so	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

(over)

	Always			Sometimes			Never
11. Has trouble making friends in school	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
12. Participates in clean-up work	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
13. Accepts responsibility	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
14. Works well with others	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
15. Is inattentive	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
16. Expresses feelings	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
17. Volunteers answers	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
18. Participates in music & art activities	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
19. Seeks assistance	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
20. Gets bored easily	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
21. Actively listens to stories	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
22. Follows directions	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
23. Tries hard	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
24. Discusses his/her experiences	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
25. Shows self-confidence	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
26. Tires easily	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
27. Follows class rules	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
28. Finishes work	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
29. Is eager to learn	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
30. Cries a lot	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Additional comments and explanations _____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
Bureau of ECIA Program Evaluation-Chapter 2

Chapter 2 All-Day Kindergarten Observation Form

School: _____ Unit: _ _ _ _ _ District: _ _

Teacher: _____ Room: _ _ _

Observer: _____ Day of Week: _____ Date: _/_/_

Starting time: _____ Ending time: _____

2:30 School ___ 3:15 School ___

Number of pupils enrolled _____ Number who attended CPC before kdg. _____

Number of pupils present _____ Number who attended other pre-school _____

Subject area of lesson observed Activities and Materials

_____

_____

_____

_____

Provisions for faster students: _____

_____

_____

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

1. Are there displays of students's work?	YES	NO
2. Are there displays indicating students' progress in various subject areas?	YES	NO
3. Are there instructional displays (e.g., alphabet, numbers, colors, days of the week)?	YES	NO
4. Is there evidence of good housekeeping?	YES	NO
5. Is classroom orderly?	YES	NO

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

6. Are there interest centers or learning centers? YES NO

7. Is there a decent playground? YES NO

   Is it used? YES NO

8. Is there any activity room or gym available? YES NO

   Is it used? YES NO

9. Are there any problems with illumination, temperature, noise, space, storage?

   _____

   _____

10. Other displays?

    _____

    _____

    _____

11. Size of room and comments about classroom environment: _____

    _____

12. Arrangement of furniture: _____

    _____

13. Quantity of supplies: _____

    _____

14. Is any AV equipment in use? Describe: _____

    _____

ACTIVITIES OF AIDE

1. Describe aide's activities — Size of group

_____ Working with students in an instructional capacity

_____ Serving in a clerical capacity

_____ Serving as a disciplinarian

_____ Preparing lesson materials

_____ Counseling students

_____ Planning with the teacher

_____ Other: _____

2. Comments about aide's activities: _____

_____

ACTIVITIES OF PARENTS

1. How many parents present in classroom during this period? _____

2. Briefly describe parents' activities: — Size of group

_____ Working with students in an instructional capacity

_____ Serving in a clerical capacity

_____ Giving a special presentation

_____ Serving as a displinarian

_____ Other: _____

3. Comments about parents' activities: _____

_____

INSTRUCTIONAL INTERACTIONS

Teacher	Comments	Yes	No	No Evidence
GENERAL INSTRUCTION:				
Gives clear, explicit directions				
Utilizes non-verbal communication skills				
Uses more than one teaching method in presentation				
Pauses, elicits, and responds to pupil questions				
Accepts feelings and ideas of students				
Asks for comparison, categorizing, inferring, generalizing, summarizing				
Evidence of personal interest in students				
Shows interest and enthusiasm in work				
Is fair and impartial				
Shows tact and good judgment				
Is creative and resourceful				
Provides for individual differences				
Evidence of a broad cultural background				
Is relaxed and friendly				
Relates new material to what has already been learned				

INSTRUCTIONAL INTERACTIONS (CONT'D)

Teacher	Comments	Yes	No	No Response
Presents neat and pleasing appearance				
Displays sense of humor				
Offers positive comments about work				
DISCIPLINE:				
Makes contact when pupil is not on task				
Maintains self-control and patience				
Uses threats or punishment				
Offers positive comments about behavior				
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT:				
Voice and expression contribute to learning				
English usage and diction contribute to learning				
Speech errors are corrected				
Presents opportunities for vocabulary improvement				
Utilizes folders for children's creative work				
Incorporates vocabulary work in all subjects and experiences				

	Comments	Yes	No	No Response
Reminds parents to read to children and take them to the library	_____	___	___	___
Allows children to choose library books	_____	___	___	___
Read or tells stories to class	_____	___	___	___

Students are:	Little				Much
Participating	1	2	3	4	5
Interacting with peers	1	2	3	4	5
Curious/interested	1	2	3	4	5
Attentive/listening	1	2	3	4	5
Using language	1	2	3	4	5
Sleepy	1	2	3	4	5

Other: _____

Disruptive behavior: _____

_____

ON TASK/OFF TASK BEHAVIOR

Make four "sweeps" of clasroom to note off task behavior.

1	2	3	4	Total
___	___	___	___	_____

COMMENTS

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C

Department of Research and Evaluation

KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM EVALUATION FY 1985

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: This questionnaire is to be completed by each kindergarten teacher. If a question doesn't apply to your classroom, leave it blank, but please attempt to answer all questions completely. Return the questionnaire by June 29 to:

Department of Research and Evaluation
Kindergarten Evaluation
1819 West Pershing Road, 5W(n)
Mail Run 95RE

A return envelope is provided for your convenience.

Person completing form: _____

School: _____ Room: _____ Unit: _ _ _ _

---

1. How many years of kindergarten teaching experience do you have?

   _____

2. Counting this year, how many years have you taught? ___ ___ years

3. What degree do you have?

   Bachelor's degree ___ Master's degree ___

4. What is your Chicago certification? (Check all that apply.)

   ___ Kindergarten/Primary Certificate
   ___ Intermediate/Upper Certificate
   ___ FTB
   ___ Other

5. In what month of this school year were you assigned to your present kindergarten class? _____

6. Please provide the following:

the total number of students in your classroom (as of June) ___ ___ ___

the number of students who attended a CPC prior to kindergarten: ___ ___ ___

the number of students who attended another preschool program: ___ ___ ___

the number of students who did not attend any preschool program: ___ ___ ___

7. On the average, how much time per day do your children spend in each of the following skill areas?

Minutes Per Day	Skill Area
___ ___ ___	Oral language/vocabulary development
___ ___ ___	Reading readiness (includes phonics, visual skill development, left-right progression, listening to directions, etc.)
___ ___ ___	Reading aloud to class
___ ___ ___	Library period
___ ___ ___	Basal reading
___ ___ ___	Math and number concepts
___ ___ ___	Social studies
___ ___ ___	Science

Minutes Per Day	Skill Area
___ ___ ___	Interest centers
___ ___ ___	Large muscle coordination (e.g. physical education)
___ ___ ___	Small muscle coordination (e.g. beadwork, writing, etc.)
___ ___ ___	Music
___ ___ ___	Art
___ ___ ___	Nutrition/food
___ ___ ___	Free play
___ ___ ___	Recess
___ ___ ___	Meal time
___ ___ ___	Rest
___ ___ ___	Other (please specify):

_____

8. How many field trips have you and your students taken this school year?

Number: ___ ___ Where did you go? _____

_____

_____

_____

9. In class how did you prepare for each field trip and then, after the trip had taken place, how did you incorporate it into your curriculum?

_____

_____

_____

9. (cont'd)

Which field trips do you feel were the most meaningful for your class and why?

10. Do you use interest centers? Explain how. _____

_____

_____

11. What time is lunch for your class? _____

12. Are you able to use mealtime as a learning experience? That is, do the children serve the food, clean up, learn table manners, or in any other way extend their social, physical, or cognitive skills? ___ Yes ___ No

Please explain: _____

_____

_____

13. Below, please list the materials you consider most valuable for your instructional activities. Be very specific.

_____

_____

_____

14. Have all ordered materials been received? ___ Yes ___ No

If "No," what's missing? _____

_____

15. What basal series do you use? _____

Are you satisfied with it? Explain: _____

_____

Is it the same series as your school's first grade uses? _____

_____

16. Briefly describe activities you've implemented or approaches you've taken to strengthen your students' affective growth.

_____

_____

_____

17. In your opinion, how many children are in your class who are not ready for the first grade? Write the number of children: ___ ___ ___

Please explain: _____

_____

_____

18. How many parents have participated in some way in your classroom on a regular basis (at least twice a month)? Number of parents: ___ ___ ___
Please describe how parents have helped in your classroom:

_____

_____

_____

19. Do you have a parent duty-roster? ___ Yes ___ No

20. Check the following activities which you have suggested to parents that they can do with their children at home:

___ read to child
___ play and/or make games
___ check homework
___ go on outings with child
___ cook with child
___ count with child
___ help child learn alphabet
___ talk with child
___ praise child
___ provide child with manipulatives, including art and writing supplies
___ get child a library card
___ other (Explain) _____
_____

21. In what manner did you make these suggestions to the parents?

___ whole-class meeting with parents
___ incidental meetings with parents
___ letter sent home
___ other (Explain) _____

22. In what ways have you tried to increase parent involvement in your classroom?

_____

_____

23. Which inservices which you have attended have been most useful and why?

_____

_____

_____

24. Do you have any suggestions for future inservices?

_____

_____

_____

25. What do you consider to be the main strengths or advantages of an all-day kindergarten?

_____

_____

_____

26. What drawbacks to an all-day kindergarten do you see?

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX D

Department of Research and Evaluation

KINDERGARTEN PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

To the parent or guardian of:

Student's name: _____

Student's ID: _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ [1-8]

School name: _____ [9-15]

School unit number: _ _ _ _ Student's room number: _ _ _

The following questions are about the kindergarten that your child attends. Your answers to these questions will help us learn how well this program is operating.

If you have more than one child in school, please remember that your answers on this form should only be about the child whose name is written above. We hope you will answer the question frankly and return the form to us in the enclosed preaddressed envelope.

No stamp is needed. Just seal the form in the envelope and drop it in any mail box as soon as you can.

Thank you!

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH QUESTION. AS SHOWN BELOW, 1 MEANS NO, 2 MEANS YES, AND 3 MEANS NOT SURE.

	NO	YES	NOT SURE	
1. Has your child enjoyed school this year?	1	2	3	[16]
2. Do you like all-day kindergarten? Please explain why or why not below.	1	2	3	[17]

_____

_____

3. Have you been satisfied with what your child has learned? Please explain.	1	2	3	[18]

_____

_____

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH QUESTION. AS SHOWN BELOW, 1 MEANS NOT THIS YEAR, 2 MEANS ONCE OR TWICE, AND 3 MEANS SEVERAL TIMES.

SINCE SCHOOL BEGAN LAST FALL --	NOT THIS YEAR	ONCE OR TWICE	SEVERAL TIMES	
4. Have you participated in any activities in the parent room?.....	1	2	3	[19]
5. Has the teacher suggested to you ways to help your child at home?.....	1	2	3	[20]
6. Have you visited your child's classroom?	1	2	3	[21]
7. Have you talked with the teacher about your child?.....	1	2	3	[22]
8. Have you helped your child with homework?.....	1	2	3	[23]
9. Have you done volunteer work in your child's classroom?.....	1	2	3	[24]
10. Have you attended any meetings for parents of kindergarten children at your school this year?.....	1	2	3	[25]

For questions 11 through 17 please check one answer.

11. During the last year, how would you describe the change in your child's self-confidence? [26]

_____ My child is much more self-confident.
_____ My child is a little more self-confident.
_____ My child's self-confidence has not changed.
_____ My child is less self-confident.

12. In the last year, how has your child's ability to work and play with other children changed? [27]

_____ My child has grown a great deal.
_____ My child has grown a little.
_____ My child has not changed much.
_____ My child has become less able to work and play with others.

13. How much do you believe your child has learned in preschool? [28]

_____ My child has learned a great deal.
_____ My child has learned a moderate amount.
_____ My child has learned little.

14. What changes have occurred in your child's ability to be independent? [29]

_____ My child is much more independent.
_____ My child is slightly more independent.
_____ My child is about the same.
_____ My child is less independent.

15. What changes have occurred in your child's ability to concentrate and finish work? [30]

_____ My child concentrates much better.
_____ My child concentrates a little better.
_____ My child has not changed much.
_____ My child concentrates worse than before.

16. Has your child become too tired as a result of attending kindergarten?

_____ Yes _____ No [31]

17. Please describe your communication with your child's school. [32]

_____ Excellent
_____ Good
_____ Fair
_____ Poor

PLEASE CHECK WHAT YOU HAVE DONE AT HOME FOR YOUR CHILD. CHECK AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.

AT HOME

[33] ___ read to child
[34] ___ played reading or math games
[35] ___ checked homework
[36] ___ helped with handwriting
[37] ___ went on outings with child
[38] ___ cooked with child
[39] ___ counted with child
[40] ___ made games
[41] ___ praised child
[42] ___ talked with child
[43] ___ provided child with art and writing supplies
[44] ___ got child a library card
[45] ___ watched TV with child
[46] ___ helped child learn alphabet
[47] ___ other, such as _____

IF YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS ABOUT KINDERGARTEN, PLEASE WRITE THEM BELOW:

APPENDIX E

DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Preschool/Kindergarten Program Evaluation

Teacher Aide Questionnaire

Directions: This questionaire is to be completed by each teacher aide in a preschool or kindergarten program. If a question doesn't apply to your classroom, leave it blank, but please attempt to answer all questions completely. Return the questionnaire in the envelope provided by June 28 to:

Department of Research and Evaluation
Kindergarten Evaluation
Mail Run 95RE

School: _____ Unit#: _ _ _ _

Room _____

1. Including this year, how long have you been a teacher aide? _____

2. What qualifies you to serve as an aide with young students? (Include educational training and experience.)

_____

_____

_____

3. How often this year were you involved in each of the following classroom tasks?

	Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Daily
Monitoring breakfast/lunch	1	2	3	4
Clerical tasks	1	2	3	4
Preparing lesson materials	1	2	3	4
Monitoring seatwork/activities	1	2	3	4
Helping individual students	1	2	3	4
Conducting lessons for small groups of students	1	2	3	4
Conducting the class in teacher's absence	1	2	3	4

4. Please describe your relationship to the teacher concerning student discipline and planning of classroom activities. Include the amount of input you have desired and/or been allowed.

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. Any comments you wish to make about the program in which you work will be appreciated.

_____

_____

_____

_____